



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TONES IN SUMERIAN

PAUL HAUPT

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

In his interesting article 'The Pronouns and Verbs of Sumerian,' published in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 54 (1915), Professor Prince stated (p. 44) that I had suggested that the different persons in the Sumerian verb might have been distinguished by a difference in quantity of the vowels of the preformatives, so that, for example, 'he made' might have been *in-gar*; 'thou madest,' *in-gar*; 'I made,' *in-gar*—*i* denoting a very short *i*, *i* a short *i*, and *i* a long *i*; cf. the three Segôls in Hebrew *elôhim* 'god,' *helqî* 'my lot,' and *timçêna* 'they [fem.] will find.'

The vowels in Aztec have four different pronunciations, and in Siamese the vowels have three quantities: very short, short, and long; cf. Misteli's new edition of Steinthal's *Charakteristik der hauptsächlichsten Typen des Sprachbaues* (Berlin, 1893), p. 113, n. 1; p. 207). Proto-Slavonic had very short, short, and long vowels, also a musical accent with different intonations (*EB*¹¹ 25. 233^b, 12; 236^b, l. 4).¹ Sweet (*Primer of Phonetics*) distinguishes very short, short, half-long (or medium), long, and very long sounds. In English we have three varieties of *i* in *military* and *police*: the second *i* in *military* is very short, the first is short, and in *police* we have a long *i*. Consequently the possibility of a differentiation of the three persons by different quantities of the vowels in the preformatives (*in*, *in*, *in*) cannot be denied; but I never advanced this theory either in my publications, or in my academic lectures, or in discussions at philological meetings, or in private conversations, or even in my wildest dreams.

Nor did Bertin (*PSBA* 5. 19) suggest such a distinction. In the paper cited by Prince he speaks only of accent = stress in Sumerian; he thought that Sumerian originally had the accent on the antepenultimate or even on the pre-antepenultimate (contrast *SFG* 55).

Accent, of course, may denote not only stress, but also pitch, intonation, modulation of the voice, manner of pronunciation.

Gabelentz, *Die Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 361, says: 'Alles das, was man unter dem französischen Namen *accent* begreift, gehört hierher: Höhe und Beugung des Tones, Rhythmus, Art der Lauterzeugung.' A man born in this country may have a pure American accent, but may misaccentuate certain words, saying, for example, *legislative*, *exigencies*, *intercálary*, *tránsferable*, *décadent*, whereas an immigrant may correctly accentuate these words, but show his foreign accent by pronouncing the *g* in *legislative* like *ch*, the *t* like *d*, and the *v* like *f*.

I fail to see how Prince with his remarkable linguistic equipment can have misunderstood both Bertin and me. When he quoted the remark I made 40 years ago (*SFG* 19, n. 6; cf. 41, l. 9) in *AJSL* 19. 205 (July 1903)² and in his *MSL* xxi (1908), he correctly interpreted the term 'accent,' which I used in 1879, to mean 'tone-accent.' I stated in *SFG* 19, n. 6, that the cuneiform characters *KIL* (*rim, xap*) = Assyr. *garâru* 'to run' and *GUR* = Assyr. *târu* 'to turn' were both read *gur* in Sumerian, but were no doubt pronounced with a different inflection of the voice,³ perhaps *gur* = *garâru* 'to run' as *gûr*, and *gur* = *târu* 'to turn' as *gûr*. I added that the tablets to be copied were sometimes dictated; so it could easily happen that a scribe did not hear which accent *gur* should have in a particular case. He might therefore write *gûr* instead of *gûr*, and it would perhaps be better to term this 'confusion of accents' instead of 'phonetic spelling.'⁴ If I had thought that there was a quantitative difference between the two syllables, I should have used *gûr* and *gûr*, not *gûr* and *gûr*. So far as I know, the acute and grave accents have never been used to distinguish long and short vowels (though the acute accent is at times found used to mark long vowels),⁵ but they have been repeatedly employed for indicating different tone-accents, e. g. by Misteli, *op. cit.* xxiv; cf. also Lepsius's *Standard Alphabet*, p. 234 and below, n 3. Sweet, *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch* (Leipzig, 1886), p. 44, used the acute accent for the rising intonation and the grave for the falling. If I speak of two monosyllables having different accents it is evident that I mean musical accents, not stress-accents.

The term 'tone' instead of 'accent' = musical accent or tone-accent was not customary in 1879, at least not in Germany. Georg Curtius in his lectures on comparative philology, which

I attended twice (in 1876 and in 1878), used the term *Betonung* for ‘intonation’ or ‘tone-accent,’ but *Betonung* means, as a rule, ‘stress’; a *betonte Silbe* is an accented syllable (cf. Gabelentz, *op. cit.* 357). The term *Betonung* is used also by Misteli (*op. cit.* 162). On p. 303 of Misteli’s work we find beside *Betonung* the term *Intonation*, and on p. 304 *Töne*. Even in this country the term *tone* = musical accent is comparatively rare. The definition of *tone* as a distinctive quality or pitch forming in some languages a fixed feature of the pronunciation of words, as in Chinese, Swedish, etc., was not given in the original edition (1889-91) of the *Century Dictionary*, although Whitney was the editor-in-chief, but in the two supplementary volumes issued in 1909. In Webster’s *New International Dictionary* the term *tone* is defined as an intonation, or inflection, of the voice which distinguishes the meaning of a word from that which it has when pronounced with a different inflection, as in Chinese and some other languages. In Pekingese *ma¹* means ‘mother,’ *ma²* ‘hemp,’ *ma³* ‘horse,’ *ma⁴* ‘to revile.’

The title of the recent article by C. B. Bradley, analyzing the tones of Cantonese and Pekingese words (*JAOS* 35. 199), is ‘Tone-accents of two Chinese Dialects,’ and whenever he uses the term *tone* he puts it in quotation-marks. On p. 201 he says: ‘“Tone” in our sense of the word is not exactly pitch at all, but rather a patterned change or movement within the field of pitch.’ He is inclined to think that there are six tones in the Cantonese dialect, which may be reduced to three, each having perhaps a short variety. Gabelentz (*op. cit.* 362) says: ‘Im Chinesischen haftet, je nach der Mundart, jedem Worte ein bestimmter Ton an, der gleichmässig gezogen, steigend oder fallend, kurz abgebrochen und dann wieder hoch oder tief sein kann.’ In *EB*¹¹ 1. 113 (1911) the Chinese tones are treated under *accent*. Dr. Giles, of Cambridge, says there (p. 113): ‘In languages like Chinese, which have neither compound words nor inflection, accent plays a very important part.’ On page 112^a he remarks: ‘Swedish also has a well-marked musical accent.’ Misteli (*op. cit.* 207) says that there are five tones, or accents, in Siamese.

The term *accent* was used in this sense also by F. Max Müller. He said in his *Lectures on the Science of Language* (New York, 1884), 1. 265: ‘Chinese has about 450 radicals. These 450

sounds are raised to 1263 by various accents and intonations.' According to Giles, whose article (*EB*¹¹ 6. 217^a) is quoted by Prince in *JAOS* 34. 326-327, there are 420 vocables in Pekingese and 800-900 in Cantonese; he remarks that Cantonese is supposed to approximate most nearly to the primitive language, whereas Pekingese (Mandarin) perhaps has receded farthest from it. In his introductory lectures to his second series of *Lectures* Max Müller stated with reference to Annamese (cf. *EB*¹¹ 2. 62^a): 'One of the early missionaries said, When I arrived in Cochin-China, and heard the natives speak, particularly the women, I thought I heard the twittering of birds, and I gave up all hope of ever learning it. All words are monosyllabic, and people distinguish their signification only by means of different accents in pronouncing them. The same syllable, for instance *dai*, signifies twenty-three entirely different things, according to the difference of accent, so that people never speak without singing. This description, though somewhat exaggerated, is correct in the main, there being six or eight musical accents or modulations in this as in other monosyllabic tongues, by which the different meanings of one and the same monosyllabic root are kept distinct. These accents form an element of the language which we have lost, but which was most important during the primitive stages of human speech.'

It is, of course, a mistake to suppose that we have lost these modulations. *EB*¹¹ 6. 217^b, below, correctly states that the Chinese tones may be compared to the half-involuntary modulations which express emotional feelings in our words. We may compare, for example, the different intonations of the words *like that*. If an artist is trying to show one of his students how a certain line should be improved, the student may ask, after having tried to carry out his master's instructions, *Like that?* i.e. 'Should it be like that?' The master thereupon may draw the line himself, adding laconically, *Like that!* i.e. 'No, it should be this way!' After critically surveying his correction for a moment and perceiving enthusiastic appreciation on the part of his pupil, he may say, *Like that?* i.e. 'Do you like that?' The tone of the first and the third *like* are entirely different, and even the second has a different intonation.

In Germany it was customary for barbers to shave their customers at home. It was also customary to shorten the salutation

Guten Morgen! to *Morgen!* just as *Gesegnete Mahlzeit!* was shortened to *Mahlzeit!* (see R. Meringer, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1899, p. 31; cf. also p. 17). A barber might meet one of his distinguished customers in the street and say respectfully, *Morgen!* i.e. ‘Good morning!’ The customer would reply, with a somewhat condescending intonation, *Morgen!* Thereupon the barber might ask, *Morgen?* i.e. ‘Shall I call at your house tomorrow?’ and the customer might reply, *Morgen!* i.e. ‘Yes, you may come tomorrow.’ The conversation would end by the barber bidding his distinguished customer again a deferential *Morgen!* i.e. ‘Good morning!’ the customer replying, somewhat nonchalantly, *Morgen!* In this brief conversation the word *Morgen* would have six different intonations; even the first and the last *Morgen* of both barber and customer would have different inflections of the voice.⁶

In the German edition (by Fick and Wischmann) of Max Müller’s work (Leipzig, 1892-93) we find (1. 357) *Accente und Betonungen* for ‘accents and intonations’; in 2. 29 *vermittelst verschiedener Betonungen in der Aussprache* is used for ‘by means of different accents in pronouncing them,’ and *sechs oder acht musikalische Accente oder Modulationen* for ‘six or eight musical accents or modulations.’ The term *musikalischer* (or *tonischer*) *Accent*⁷ is used also by Sievers in his *Phonetik*⁵ (Leipzig, 1901), § 600, 602, 661. Sievers introduced these terms in the second edition of his book (1881), § 30 (contrast p. 114 in the first edition of 1876). On p. 80 of his *Rhythmisch-melodische Studien* (Heidelberg, 1912) Sievers speaks of *Worttonhöhen* in Chinese, etc. The term *tone* is found in Jespersen’s *Elementarbuch der Phonetik* (Leipzig, 1912), p. 182 (15. 8). Viétor’s *Kleine Phonetik*⁹ (Leipzig, 1913), § 131, distinguishes *Dauer*, *Stärke*, *Höhe*, i.e. quantity or length, stress or force, and intonation or pitch. For *accent* = ‘stress’ Jespersen employs *Druck* (14. 1) = *Nachdruck* (Sievers, *Phonetik*⁵, § 570). The term *tones* was used as early as 1857 by Edkins in his *Grammar of Colloquial Chinese* (2d ed., Shanghai, 1864). He said: ‘By natural tones are meant certain inflections of the voice and variations in time and pitch used with vowels and consonants’; see the quotations in Techmer’s *Phonetik*, 1. 182. Techmer gave there also some remarks on tones in certain African languages (Hottentot, Mandingo), and on p. 180 he quoted

Storm's résumé on tones in Norwegian and Swedish (cf. also p. 70 and *EB*¹¹ 24. 297^a, 298^a). The term *tones* was used also in Lepsius's *Standard Alphabet* (London, 1863), p. 232, 234, 241, 243.

Nevertheless these quotations from phoneticians and linguists show that I was perfectly justified in using the term *accents* instead of *tones*, and Prince's misunderstanding of the plain statements made by Bertin and myself in English and German may create a certain prejudice against his explanations of intricate syntactical problems in Sumerian. I do not prefer the term *accent* to *tone*; I merely want to explain why I used *accent* instead of *tone* 40 years ago. I was convinced in 1878 that there were tone-accents in Sumerian as in Chinese, Annamese, Siamese, Lithuanian, Serbian, Swedish, Norwegian, Hottentot, and Mandingo, but I never entertained the idea that in the cases where the Sumerian preformatives of the third person seem to be used for the first or second person there was a quantitative or tonal difference in the vowels. This phenomenon must be explained in a different way; in a number of such cases we have a different construction in Sumerian.

In the incantation *ASKT* 79 we find, for example, for the Assyrian *gibil ina išātika elliti ina bít ekliti nûra tašákan* 'O Firegod, with thy bright fire thou makest light in the house of darkness,' in Sumerian *gibil izâ-zu ela laḡlaḡa⁸ e-giggiga laḡ ab-gaga*, which means literally 'O Firegod, thy fire bright and radiant the house of darkness light makes,' so that *ab-gaga* is the third person, not the second (cf. *CV* 21).⁹ We need not read *kuga* (*SGl* 126) instead of *giggiga*. The gloss *kuga* is a synonym of *giga*; cf. Arabic *rayâḥ* (*AJSL* 22. 203). The older form of *gič*,¹⁰ *gi* was *mi*. The change of *mi* to *gi* was not due to nasalization (*SGl* 100, n. 1). *Gi=g̃ui=ui=mi*; see *OLZ* 17. 454 and my note on Armenian *g* for *u* in *ZDMG* 69. 564; cf. also the modern form *Guštāsp* for the Old Persian *Vištāspa* (Jackson, *Persia Past and Present*, p. 64; *Zoroaster*, p. 5). It might be well to add here that the Biblical *Tatnai* is not a corruption of *Vištâna* (*JBL* 32. 114; contrast *AJSL* 24. 244; *GB*^{1s} 931^b). For *eklitu* 'darkness' see *OLZ* 16. 492.

It is, of course, important that the Sumerian forms be correctly analyzed. For instance, we must not read in 4 R² 10. 37^b (*ZB* 65) *šu-bu ban-nip* instead of *šu git-ban-nip* (*SGl* 90; *SG*

§ 128 e) and regard *bu* as a possessive suffix modified by vocalic harmony. Nor must the root *ip* ‘to be wroth’ in *ib-ba-bi* ‘his wrath’ or ‘he against whom someone is incensed’ = *al-maḡdâbu* ‘*alážhi* in the first sūrah of the Koran be explained as a pre-formative of the second person (*MSL* xxvii, § 26 = *AJSL* 19. 215, § 26). The correct explanation of *ib-ba-bi* ‘who has provoked wrath’ was given 37 years ago in *ASKT* 188, no. 101. For *git* = *cabâtu* see *CV* 25.

In some cases Prince is very conservative: in *Proc. Am. Phil. Soc.* 54. 34, l. 2 (cf. also *AJSL* 33. 44, *ad* l. 20) he gives, for example, the old incorrect reading *muḡ* for the preposition corresponding to the Assyrian *elî* ‘over,’ although he has on the preceding page the correct reading *ugu* in *ugu-zu-nene* = Assyr. *elikunu* ‘upon you.’ I have explained the agglutination in the plural forms of the Sumerian possessive suffixes and in the corresponding Semitic forms in *Judges* (*SBOT*) 65. 46 (cf. *CV* 12). This *ugu* is connected with *gu* ‘neck, shoulder,’ which is used also for ‘height’ (*SGl* 102), just as Heb. *katéf* is used of the high table-land of Moab or of the Philistine foothills or of the hills east of the Sea of Galilee (*TOCR* 1. 303). Also *Shechem*, on the high road from north to south, means ‘shoulder.’ Sum. *ugu* is a formation like *ugur* ‘sword’ from *gur* ‘to cut up’ (*SGl* 43; cf. *CV* 35; contrast *SG* 155, *ad* § 58, 59).¹¹

The reading *ugu* should have been adopted before Brünnow (8888; cf. Meissner 6597) recorded it, since we knew that the Sumerian equivalent of Assyr. *na'butu* ‘to flee,’ *ugu-de*, could be written either with the sign *U* = *bēlu* ‘lord’ or with the sign *U* = *šam* ‘herb’ (cf. Brünnow 6035, 6721). That the first element of the Sumerian expression for ‘to flee’ should not be read *muḡ*, but that the *U* = *bēlu* should be separated from the *KA* = *gu*, was pointed out in *SFG* 52. 2. The *de* in this phrase is not the verb *de* ‘to speak’ (originally ‘to flow’; cf. our *flow* of eloquence, *fluency* of speech, and also *to dry up* = ‘to cease talking’), but is a byform of *du* ‘to go,’ so that *ugu-de* corresponds to Assyr. *ētelû* ‘to get up and get away.’ In Arabic, *rāfa'a* means ‘to lift, raise’ and ‘to remove,’ and *irtafa'a* ‘to be raised or removed.’ Arab. *tála'a* signifies ‘to rise, ascend’ and also ‘to go away’ (Arab. *tála'a* ‘áñhum ídâ gâba). In modern Arabic *tála'a* is used also for ‘to go out, to leave’ (cf.

Mic. 73, l. 2; *ZA* 30. 97). In the third Sumerian family law (cf. *ZA* 30. 93) we find *ina biti u igari étélâ* ‘he must leave hovel or mansion,’ i.e. it makes no difference whether his father be poor or rich (contrast *BA* 4. 86). The word *igaru* has here the same meaning as in l. 22 of the Flood Tablet, while *bîtu* corresponds to *qiqqišu*. In Arabic, *bait* (from *bâ* ‘he entered’; cf. above, p. 254) means not only ‘house,’ but also ‘tent’ (cf. *baitu* ‘l-ṣa’ri’). On the other hand, the Assyrian equivalent of Hebrew *ōhl* ‘tent,’ *ālu*, meant ‘city’ (*AJSL* 22. 199; cf. also *BA* 3. 579). I have shown (*JAOS* 32. 6) that Assyr. *qiqqišu* is a reduplicated form of Heb. *qaš* ‘straw,’ just as French *chaume* means ‘stalk, stubble’ and ‘hut’ (= *chaumine*, *chaumière*). Luther used *Hütte* ‘hut’ for ‘tent.’ The original meaning of *hut* is ‘wattle, hurdle.’

In a great many cases we find in Sumerian the third person instead of the first, e.g. *mae¹²* *eri-zu ide-zu mun-gam-am* = Assyr. *anâku aradka maxarka kansaku* ‘I, thy servant, before thee I bow’ (4 R² 24, no. 3, l. 10). The Sumerian construction is here: ‘I, thy servant, before thee bows,’ not ‘I bow.’ The pronoun *I* may be construed with the third person, especially when it is followed by ‘thy servant.’ We are all familiar with *I is* instead of *I am* (cf. on the other hand *ain’t, don’t* for *is not, does not*). Assyrian *kansaku* stands for *kamsaku*; the stem *kamâsu* is a transposition (cf. *AJSL* 32. 64) of Heb. *samâk* ‘to prop, support’; the original meaning of Assyr. *kamâsu* ‘to collapse’ is ‘to be unpropped.’ For the etymology of *ardu* ‘servant’ see *ZDMG* 69. 172, n. 11.

In the same way we must explain the third person instead of the first in *u-turâni-ta*, ‘from the days of his youth’ = Assyr. *ultu ûm qixriku* ‘from the time I was young’: *u-turâni-ta* is co-ordinated to the suffix *mu* in *mulu ugu-mu zeba*, ‘what is good for me,’ in the preceding line. The construction, from our point of view, is: ‘May she do what is good for me—me, O Lady, who from the days of his youth is fast bound to adversity, who ate no bread, weeping was my refreshment,’ etc. (cf. *CV* xxxv; *ZB* 34). In connection with the phrase ‘fast bound to adversity’ I have called attention to the line of Mutalammis (*BL* 92): *inna ’l-mar’ah rahnu muçibati*” (cf. *JBL* 32. 141) = ‘man is a pledge¹³ of adversity’ (see *BA* 5. 215, n. **).

In the dialogue between Ea and his son Marduk, which we find in the fifth tablet of the *Šurpu* series,¹⁴ the Assyrian version

has (*ZR* 26. 30): *mârî minâ lâ tîdî* ‘my son, what dost thou not know?’ but the Sumerian text has: *dumu-mu ana nu-ni-zu*, ‘my son, what does he not know?’ We can say, ‘What does my son not know?’ instead of ‘What dost thou not know?’ (contrast *SG* 157, *ad § 150*). We often use the third person instead of the second or first. A little boy may say, ‘Johnnie has tummy-ache’ instead of ‘I have pains in my stomach.’ In the first scene of *King Lear*, Cordelia says: ‘What shall Cordelia speak? Love, and be silent!’ and Kent says to Lear: ‘Be Kent unmannerly, when Lear is mad.’ In the second act of Wagner’s *Walküre* Wotan says to Brünnhilde: ‘Brünnhilde stürme zum Kampf, dem Wälsung kiese sie Sieg’ instead of ‘Brünnhilde, stürme zum Kampf, dem Wälsung kiese du Sieg.’ Later in the same act Siegmund asks Brünnhilde: ‘Umfängt Siegmund Sieglinde dort?’ to which Brünnhilde replies: ‘Sieglinde sieht Siegmund dort nicht.’

We may substitute the third person for the first or second in relative clauses. For Hebrew *ānî ɬahûê mēqaddêšô* (Lev. 21. 15; 22. 9, 16) we may say ‘I am the Lord which sanctify him’ (Revised Version) or ‘I am the Lord who sanctifies him’ (Poly-chrome Bible). Similarly we may say for ‘Our Father, which art in heaven’ (Authorized Version) ‘Our Father, who is in heaven.’ If the first or second person of the verb is used in connection with a relative pronoun, it is necessary in German to insert the pronoun of the first or second person: ‘Unser Vater, der du bist im Himmel.’

In Syriac one may use in a relative clause after a vocative either the second person or the third (see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*² § 350 b, c). In Arabic we generally find in this case the third person, e.g. *iâ ãjjuhâ 'lladîna âmanû* ‘O ye who believe,’ not *âmântum*; but it is more usual to say *a-lâsta 'l-'âbda 'lladî kûnta* ‘art thou not the slave who wast?’ instead of *a-lâsta 'l-'âbda 'lladî kâna* ‘art thou not the slave who was?’ (see *WdG* 2. 324 b; 319 c; Reckendorf, § 198; Spitta, § 206 d; Fleischer, *KS* 1. 802; cf. *GK* § 155 m; also Dillmann², p. 466, 1. 3).

We may say ‘A new song will I sing Thee, O God, who givest victory’ or ‘who gives victory.’ In Ps. 144. 10 we find co-ordinated to ‘Thee’ in v. 9: ‘who saves His servant from the sword’ = Hebrew *Elôhîm šîr-hadâš ašîrâ-lak . . . hap-pôqê 't-'âbdô me-hârb*.¹⁵ In Ps. 104 the Authorized Version has: ‘Thou art clothed with honor and majesty, who coverest thyself with light

as with a garment, who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain,' but in the following verses the third person is used instead of the second: 'Who layeth the beams of His chambers in the waters, who maketh the clouds His chariot, who walketh upon the wings of the wind, who maketh His angels spirits, His ministers a flaming fire.' The Polychrome Bible here substitutes the second person (cf. *JHUC*, no. 163, p. 48^b).

There are a great many passages in the Old Testament where we may substitute the second person for third and vice versa; cf., for example, Ps. 106 and 136. For a series of co-ordinated participles, either with or without the article, cf. Ps. 136. 4; 144. 10; 145. 16; 146. 6; 147. 8; also the fragments of the Maccabean psalm scattered through the Book of Amos (4. 12, 13; 5. 8, 9; 9. 5, 6). The portions preserved consist of three triplets with 3 + 3 beats. The last line of the third triplet is lost. It has been replaced by a repetition of the second triplet. For *ā'śē* in the first line of the first triplet (4. 12) we must read the third person (*ia'śē*). We find these co-ordinated participles also in the cuneiform prototypes (*JHUC*, no. 163, p. 54^a) of the Biblical Psalms, e.g. *ASKT* 116. 6, 8, 10 (*CV* xxxv; *ZB* 33; *DB* 1. 169^a, 1. 6). For the Assyrian participles the Sumerian has here the simple roots without any preformatives or afformatives, e.g. *šem-mumu* = Assyr. *mušeçât urkîti* 'she who causes herbage to sprout'; *u-tu duâbi-ene* = Assyr. *bânât kalâmi* 'she who generates everything.'

The Hebrew parallels cited above help us to understand the substitution of the third person for the second in Sumerian hymns and incantations. In 4 R² 20, no. 2, l. 7, we find, for example, for the Assyrian version *šamaš ana māti rēšika taššâ* 'O Sungod, thou hast lifted thy head toward the land' in Sumerian: *babbar kalamâ-ta sagâna-šu mi-nin-il* 'O Sungod, in the land with his head he lifts' (cf. *SFG* 58, n. 5; contrast *SG* 121, n. 2). We may regard this as a relative clause, equivalent to Hebrew *han-nôšē bē-rôšō 'el-ha-'árç* (for the *bē-* cf. *našâ bē-rôšô* = ἀνύψωσεν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ in Sir. 11. 13; also *GK* § 119 q and *JBL* 32. 112, n. 19; 113, n. 23).

If we use *Your Excellency* or *Your Lordship*, or similar forms of address, we employ the third person instead of the second. We also prefer the third person to the first in formal invitations and replies. If a letter begins with 'The undersigned,'

or ‘An old soldier who,’ or ‘A poor woman who,’ the third person is used instead of the first. In English we say ‘you would expect’ for the German *man würde erwarten*. In Hebrew one may say ‘he [or they] will expect,’ although the second person may be used (*GK* § 144 b, d, f, h; *Mic.* 25, n. 17). If we find in Hebrew the third person feminine in cases like *yat-téçr-lô* instead of *uai-iéçr-lô*, we must supply *nafšô* ‘his soul.’ In German a person is now addressed *Sie* ‘they’; some punctilious people use this also for *er* ‘he’ when referring to a person in his presence: instead of saying ‘er hat mir soeben gesagt, er müsste morgen abreisen’ they will say ‘sie haben mir soeben gesagt, sie müssten morgen abreisen’ (cf. *BL* 26, n. †). I have heard men address a young apprentice *du*, an old coachman *Ihr*, and a little boy *du* or *er* (e.g. ‘will er wohl!’ instead of ‘willst du wohl!’ sc. ‘das sein lassen,’ i.e. ‘stop that!’)

In the eighth and ninth centuries of our era princes and high dignitaries were addressed *Ihr*. In the 17th century it was customary to say *Er* for ‘you.’ The plural *Sie haben* has been used for *Er hat* in the sense of ‘you have’ since the end of the 17th century. Schiller’s father, who died in 1796, addressed his son in his letters *Er*.¹⁶ In Schiller’s *Die Räuber* (1781) Franz addresses his father *Ihr*, while he thouz his son; Karl uses *Sie* in speaking to the Catholic father. For *Er* cf. the opening scenes of Lessing’s *Minna von Barnhelm*. In the Bavarian army officers addressed enlisted men *Er* down to 1868. Originally *Er* was preceded by *der Herr*, corresponding to Hebrew *ădōnî*, and this form of address is still used in certain cases: a waiter may say, ‘Wünschen der Herr zu speisen?’ In the German army not only privates and non-commissioned officers, but even lieutenants will not say to a captain, ‘Haben Sie sonst noch Befehle, Herr Hauptmann?’ but ‘Haben der Herr Hauptmann sonst noch Befehle?’ It is also considered more polite to say ‘Gnädige Frau gestatten?’ instead of ‘Gestatten Sie, gnädige Frau?’

In modern Hebrew it is still good form to use the third person instead of the second. For ‘come in!’ for example, one says *ı̄abô!* i.e. ‘let him come!’ A lady will say to a guest at her table: *ı̄ošit-lî-nâ ’et-çallahtô ūe-’asîma lë-fanây haṭîkât baśâr çalî*, lit. ‘may he pass me his plate, and I will place before him

a slice of roasted meat'; or *it'óm-nâ hatikát çalî 'eql* 'may he taste a slice of roast veal?' for 'Won't you try a slice of roast veal?'¹⁷ The third person is more formal and more polite than the second. In giving an order to a servant the second person would be used, just as one uses *voi* in speaking to an Italian cabman or porter, but in addressing a gentleman one says *Lei* (lit. 'her'; cf. our 'it can't be me' and the expression 'thee is' used by the Friends instead of 'thou art')¹⁸ or *Ella* 'she' with the third person singular, e.g. *ha Ella avuto nuove di suo fratello?* = 'have you had news of your brother?' lit. 'has she [viz. *vostra signoria*] Your Lordship] had news of her brother?' Some writers use the feminine even in the verb, e.g. *quando è Ella arrivata?* = 'when did you arrive?' (addressed to a gentleman).

Also in Spanish the third person is used instead of the second, because 'you' = 'thou' is expressed by *usted* = *vuestra merced* 'Your Grace' (Portuguese *vossê* = *vossa merce*). 'Have you your cane?' is in Spanish *tiene V. su baston?* lit. 'has Your Grace his cane?' In the Middle Ages *vos* was used instead of *tú*.

In conclusion I wish to emphasize the following points:—

(a) Sumerian was a tonal language; apparently identical syllables which have entirely different meanings may have been distinguished by tones, as in Chinese or Siamese (cf. *SFG* 19. 6; *AJSL* 19. 205, n. 7; 24. 355; *JAOS* 34. 322, 326).¹⁹

(b) The three different persons were not distinguished by different tones of the verbal preformatives.

(c) Nor were they differentiated by the quantity of the vowels of the preformatives.

(d) The pronouns of the first and second persons may be construed with the third person of the verb.

(e) Even without a pronoun of the first or second persons, or words like *thy servant* or *my lord*, the third person of the verb may be used for the first or second persons.

(f) In cases where a vocative seems to be followed by the third person of the verb instead of the second, we may regard the statement after the vocative as a relative clause, at least from our point of view; cf. the Hebrew appositional participles in Ps. 104. 2-6 and similar passages.

NOTES

¹ For the abbreviations see vol. 34, p. 425, n. 6.—*SG*, *SGL*, *SS* = Delitzsch, *Sumerische Grammatik, Sumer. Glossar, Sumer. Sprachlehre*, Leipzig, 1914.—*ZB* = Zimmern, *Babylonische Busspsalmen*, Leipzig, 1885. Cf. *JBL* 36. 75.

² This article, apart from the two introductory paragraphs, is reprinted (with some slight modifications) in *MSL* xx-xxxv.

³ I said ‘mit verschiedener Stimmbiegung.’ The same expression is used in Meyer’s *Grosses Konversations-Lexikon*, 4. 60^a (1903): ‘Tonakzente, d.h. Stimmbiegungen.’ This article also uses the acute and grave accents for indicating the Chinese tones, e.g. *chī* ‘to know,’ *chì* ‘finger,’ *chí* ‘to be willing,’ *chǐ* ‘upright.’ In Brockhaus’s *Konversations-Lexikon*, 4. 166 (1901), the term *Töne* is employed, and the grave accent is used for one of them: *lī* ‘plum,’ *lī* ‘pear.’

⁴ For phonetic writing in Sumerian cf. *SGL* 143, l. 13; 150, l. 2; 190, *mud* 4; 200, l. 8; 269, l. 2. *SGL* 91-92 (cf. 278) states that *gir* ‘dagger’ is used incorrectly for *gîr* ‘foot,’ and vice versa. The root *duk* ‘to speak’ is often written *tuk* = ‘to take’ (*SGL* 147, 161; *SG* § 156). *SGL* 77, l. 12 calls the use of *gal* ‘great’ for *gal* ‘to be’ ‘schlechte Schreibweise’ (cf. also 141, l. 10; 237, l. 2; 242, l. 5; 281, last line but one; 284, *maš* 5; 285, *gap*). *SGL* 106, l. 16; 246, l. 1; 264, *šeš* 3, uses the term *Ideogrammverwechselung* (cf. *SG* § 12). In a German rebus (cf. Lagarde, *Mitteilungen*, 4. 364; *BL* 131, n. *) the idea of a cemetery might be expressed by an enclosed space (yard, cf. churchyard, graveyard) and a personification of Peace, because very few Germans know that the first syllable of *Friedhof* ‘cemetery’ is not the word *Friede* ‘peace,’ but is connected with *Einfriedigung* ‘fence, enclosure.’ Both *Friede* and *Einfriedigung* are, of course, derived from the same stem (cf. *AJSL* 22. 203, below; *JBL* 29. 87, l. 5).

⁵ Certain English Orientalists use the acute accent in place of the macron or the circumflex to indicate long vowels. But the grave is not used for the breve. Our use of the grave in poetry corresponds, in some respects, to the Syriac *mēhagiānā* (Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.* § 52. 5). The acute accent indicates long vowels in Hungarian. The Masoretic punctuation of Hebrew does not distinguish between long and accented vowels; the Hebrew words for ‘king,’ ‘book,’ ‘ear’ should be pronounced μέλχ, σέφρ, ḥξν (*AJSL* 26. 20, n. 11). The vowels of the second syllable in קְנַתְלָ and חֵן are accented, but not long (read ְקְנֹתְלָ, חֵנֶן). Greek names like Παῦλος appear in Hebrew as פּוֹלוֹס; cf. Albrecht, *Neuhebr. Gr.* (1913) § 7 d; Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*² p. 34, l. 5. Also the Çérê in the imperatives of the verbs לְהַנִּהְנָה and לְהַנִּתְנָה are accented, but not long (read ְהַנְּהָה, ְהַנְּתָה).

and in the construct state of nouns in *-ē* (like *sadē* ‘field’) is not a long *ē*, but an accented short *ĕ*. English-speaking Jews often confound long and short vowels, saying, for example, *sin* for *seen*, and *seen* for *sin*. Cf. also Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*² § 42, 47, 48.

⁶ Cf. also 2. 30 of the German edition of Max Müller’s *Lectures*; Techmer, *Phonetik*, 1. 70; Sievers, *Phonetik*⁵, § 602; Sweet, *Elementarbuch des gesprochenen Englisch*², p. 44 (*Ton-höhe*).

⁷ This does not correspond to our ‘tonic accent,’ which is generally used for ‘syllabic stress’; but the title of Samuel Wells Williams’s dictionary (Canton, 1856) was *A Tonic Dictionary of the Chinese Language*.

⁸ The Sumerian *ḡ* is a *ⱥ = ḡ* (*SFG* 71; *ASKT* 135; *CV* 6; *BA* 1. 255). Prince (e.g. *JAOS* 34. 323; 36. 95) uses *ḡ* for *ḡ*, but *ḡ* is the symbol for *ጀ*, i.e. our *j*.

⁹ According to *SG* § 147 c, *tašakan* = *ap-gaga* is wrong; but it is just as correct as the free translation of *ḡe-pa* ‘let him be conjured’ by *lù-tamât* ‘be thou conjured’ (see *SGL* 73, *pat* 2; *SG* § 152 a, c; also § 170, and especially p. 157, *ad* § 150; cf. p. 4, l. 5, and the remarks on the prohibitive in § 158). Also the alleged forms of the first person given in *SG* § 151 are forms of the third person; *mu-ra-du*, Gudea Cyl. B, 2. 20, does not mean ‘I have built for thee,’ but ‘he [viz. Gudea; cf. l. 7, 12, and 3. 2] has built for thee.’

¹⁰ For the reading *gik* instead of *gig* see *JAOS* 32. 12, l. 4; *JBL* 32. 139, n. 2; *OLZ* 17. 454.

¹¹ Similarly we have *uduk* ‘weapon,’ originally ‘killer’; this is also the primary meaning of the name of the demon Uduk (*SGL* 45). The original connotation of *ugu* ‘parent’ (*SGL* 43) may be ‘raiser,’ i.e. ‘one who raises [or brings up] a child.’ The original form was, it may be supposed, *ugun*. The prototype of Aram. *attûnâ* ‘oven,’ Sumer. *udun*, may be derived from *tun*, *dun* ‘to dig, excavate’ (*SGL* 152). Assyr. *utûnu* ‘oven’ (*SGL* 45) is synonymous with *tinûru*, Heb. *tannûr*. *DB* 2. 73^a states that the term *tannûr* is still in use in the Lebanon for a special kind of oven in which the women bake bread. A pit is dug in the earth, and a hollow cylinder of pottery, about two feet in diameter, is let down into it. Cf. also *DB* 3. 637^a; *EB* 605 and 270. Sumer. *gir* ‘oven,’ the prototype of Heb. *gîr* (Is. 27. 9) and *kîrâim* (Lev. 11. 35), denotes especially an asphalt-furnace or pitch-pot (cf. *KAT*² 516; *BL* 131; *JBL* 36. 93).

¹² If the *ae* in *mae* (later *gae*) was pronounced as a diphthong (cf. p. 28 of Prince’s paper cited at the beginning of this article), the pronunciation may have been *mai* (our *my*), but not *mö* (= French *eu* in *meute* or *Meuse*). Sievers, *Phonetik*⁵

§ 415, says that the diphthongs in German *Hain*, *Haus* are really *ae* and *ao*, not *ai* and *au*.

¹³ Cf. *Measure for Measure*, 2. 2. 92: 'Your brother is a forfeit of the law,' and Greek ἔνοχος νόμῳ; θανάτῳ πάντες ὄφειλόμεθα; τύχη ἐνέχει, Sophocles, *Phil.* 1086; Lat. *sorti destinatus*. The primary meaning of *destinare* is 'to fasten, to bind' (cf. Arab. *râhana* = *hábasa*). Assyr. šalpūtu 'adversity' (= *šalputtu*, from *lapātu*; *HW* 384^a) does not correspond to Heb. *sälf*. We have the stem of Heb. *sälf* in Assyr. *zaliptu* 'wickedness' (*HW* 256^b). The *s* in Hebrew and Arabic (*fásila*) is due to partial assimilation (cf. *JBL* 36. 141, n. 4).

¹⁴ Cf. *JBL* 19. 62, n. 8; *AJSL* 13. 142.

¹⁵ The words *râ'â* after *me-härb* and *daiyid* before '*abdô*' are glosses.

¹⁶ Cf. the articles *Duzen* and *Er* in *Brockhaus* (see above, n. 3).

¹⁷ See J. Rosenberg, *Hebr. Conversationsgrammatik*, p. 77, 104. Rosenberg writes *hatîhat* instead of *hatîkat* (corrected on p. 180). Siegfried-Baentsch, on the other hand, wrote *Mordehai* for *Mordekai*; see *Esra, Nehemia und Ester* (Göttingen, 1901), p. 135-139, 152-175.

¹⁸ *Thee* is used for *thou* in the dialect of West Somerset; also *you* was accusative (and dative) until about the 16th century, the nominative being *ye* (cf. *EB*¹¹ 12. 326^a; *Century Dictionary*, p. 7012^a).

¹⁹ The same view was expressed by Amiaud in 1888; see Weissbach, *Die sumerische Frage* (Leipzig, 1898), p. 104, n. 8; cf. p. 172.